UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/011,029	11/13/2001	Chandrashekar R. Padala	42390P13128	7523

8791   7590   05/02/2006

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD
SEVENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030

EXAMINER
SWEARINGEN, JEFFREY R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2145	

DATE MAILED: 05/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/011,029	PADALA, CHANDRASHEKAR R.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jeffrey R. Swearingen	2145	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>*09 February 2006*</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-21* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>*09 February 2006*</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1).☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR

1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued

examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the

finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's

submission filed on 2/9/2006 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of

the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for

the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed
> publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

4.   Claims 1-9, 11-14, 16-18 and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by

Stoica et al. ("Chord: A Scalable Peer-to-peer Lookup Service for Internet Applications").

5.   In regard to claim 1, Stoica disclosed

              a first plurality of peer devices; (Stoica, 149, column 1, section 1 disclosed a peer-to-peer

system)

              a first network server coupled to the first plurality of peer devices, the first network server

to manage and maintain a first name-to-address resolution index that includes a list of addresses

for the first plurality of peer devices, the first network server configured to respond to requests for

a peer device addresses of the first plurality of peer devices by querying the first name-to-address

index; (Stoica, 150, lines 1-7 disclosed peer-to-peer lookups of devices based on queries. See

further 150, 4th full paragraph. Note that Stoica did not need a server, *per se*. Therefore a peer in

Stoica functioned as a server based on peer-to-peer operation. See further Stoica, 151,

Distributed Indexes.)

       a second plurality of peer devices; (Stoica, 149, column 1, section 1)

       a second network server coupled to the second plurality of peer devices and to the first

network server, to manage and maintain a second name-to-address resolution index that includes

a list of addresses for the second plurality of peer devices, the second network server configured

to respond to a request for a peer device address of one of the first plurality of peer devices by

querying the first network server such that the second network server responds to the request

with the peer device address of the one of the first plurality of peer devices as though the request

was for a peer device address of one of the second plurality of peer devices. (Stoica, 150, lines 1-

7 disclosed peer-to-peer lookups of devices based on queries. See further 150, 4th full

paragraph)

6.   In regard to claim 2, Stoica disclosed:

       wherein the first and second network servers are at equivalent hierarchical levels.

(Stoica was a peer-to-peer system; therefore all peers/servers were at the equivalent hierarchical

level.)

7.   In regard to claim 3, Stoica disclosed:

       wherein the first and second network servers have a common zone relationship. (Stoica

was a peer-to-peer network; therefore all peers/servers were in a "common zone relationship".)

8.   In regard to claim 4, Stoica disclosed:

       the second network server requires access authorization from the first network server

before a common zone is established. (Stoica, 150, section 3, Availability)

9. In regard to claim 5, Stoica disclosed:

a third plurality of peer devices; (Stoica, 149, column 1, section 1) *and*

a third network server coupled to the third plurality of peer devices and to the second network server, the third network server to manage and maintain a third name-to-address resolution index that includes a list of addresses for the third plurality of peer devices, the third network server configured to respond to the request for the peer device address of the one of the first plurality of peer devices by querying the second network server such that the third network server responds to the request with the peer device address of the one of the first plurality of peer devices as though the request was for a peer device address of one of the third plurality of peer devices. (Stoica, 151, Distributed Indexes. This was the operation of the Gnutella or Napster system.)

10. In regard to claim 6, Stoica disclosed:

the second network server is also configured to query the third name-to-address index such that the second network server responds to a request for a peer device address of one of the third plurality of peer devices as though the request was for a peer device address of one of the second plurality of peer devices. (Stoica, 151, Distributed Indexes. This was the operation of the Gnutella or Napster system.)

11. In regard to claim 7, Stoica disclosed:

the first network server is also configured to query the second name-to-address index such that the first network server responds to a request for a peer device address of one of the second plurality of peer devices as though the request was for a peer device address of one of the first plurality of peer devices. (Stoica, 151, Distributed Indexes. This was the operation of the Gnutella or Napster system.)

12. Claim 8 is substantially the same as claim 1.

13.   In regard to claim 9, Stoica disclosed:

        an output interface to couple the processing unit to the at least one peer on the first

network. This was inherent to the Stoica system.

14.   Claim 11 is substantially the same as claim 2.

15.   Claim 12 is substantially the same as claim 3.

16.   Claim 13 is substantially the same as claim 4.

17.   Claim 14 is substantially the same as claims 1 and 3.

18.   Claim 16 is substantially the same as claim 4.

19.   In regard to claim 17, Stoica disclosed:

        wherein there is no common zone relationship between the first server and the second

server, and derivative common zone name-to-address resolution is selectively permitted by a

server having common zone relationships with the first server and the second server. (Stoica,

151, Distributed Indexes. This was the operation of the Gnutella or Napster system.)

20.   Claim 18 is substantially the same as claim 1.

21.   Claim 20 is substantially the same as claims 3 and 4.

22.   Claim 21 is substantially the same as claim 17.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

23.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness

rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

24.   Claims 10, 15 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stoica,

and further in view of Official Notice.

25.   In regard to claims 10, 15 and 19, Stoica failed to disclose returning an error message if the

requested address was not found. However, the Office takes Official Notice that error messages were

commonly returned when an address was not found in many scenarios involving a network, such as in

use of the PING and TRACEROUTE network management commands and in the use of a web browser

with messages such as 404 errors. DNS and peer-to-peer systems were both well known networking

systems that involved communication between addresses similar to the communications performed by the

PING and TRACEROUTE commands. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art at the time of the invention to issue error messages in any networking system to illustrate a failure

to communicate with or locate a particular address, file, or machine.

Conclusion

26.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure..

Thornton et al.   US 6,363,065 B1

Freeman et al.   US 6,785,713 B1

Danzig, Peter et al. "An Analysis of Wide-Area Name Server Traffic: A Study of the Internet

Domain Name System." Conference proceedings on Communications Architectures and

Protocols. Baltimore, MD. 1992. ACM Press. 281-92.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should

be directed to Jeffrey R. Swearingen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3921. The examiner can

normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

Jason Cardone can be reached on 571-272-3933. The fax phone number for the organization where this

application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application

Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from

either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through

Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC)

at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jason Cardone
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2145